UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,417	05/05/2006	Andrew Thomas Busey	104128-213501/US	2415
	7590 09/15/200 TRAURIG, LLP (SV)	EXAMINER		
IP DOCKETIN	G	TRAN, PHILIP B		
2450 COLORADO AVENUE SUITE 400E		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SANTA MONICA, CA 90404			2155	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/578,417	BUSEY, ANDREW THOMAS			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Philip B. Tran	2155			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 Jules</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrav 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers	vn from consideration.				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine					
 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/6/08.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite			

Art Unit: 2155 Paper Dated 20080908

Response to Amendments

Notice to Applicant

1. This communication is in response to amendment filed 17 June 2008. Claims 1-7 and 9-11 have been amended. Claims 13-20 have been newly added. Therefore, claims 1-20 are pending for further examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-14, 16-17 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brewster et al (Hereafter, Brewster), U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US 2002/0147847 in view of Forsyth, U.S. Pat. No. 7,047,030.

Regarding claim 1, Brewster teaches a method performed by at least one information handling system associated with a first client, the method comprising:

receiving an excerpt of information (i.e., receiving a first document submitted by a first user) [see Fig. 2 and Paragraph 0017 and Page 3, Right Col., Lines 20-21]; and in response to a configuration specified by one or more files of the information

handling system, performing at least one of the following operations:

automatically translating the excerpt from an XML format into a non-XML format, so that the translated excerpt is compatible for operation with the information handling system; and automatically translating the excerpt from the XML format into an alternate

Art Unit: 2155 Paper Dated 20080908

XML format, so that the translated excerpt is compatible for operation with the information handling system (i.e., using XSL stylesheet to translate the XML document into different viewable formats) [see Paragraphs 0016-0017].

Brewster does not explicitly teach an excerpt of information comprising an item of music. However, Forsyth, in the same field of file sharing endeavor, discloses sharing file including music item among a group of users [see Forsyth, Col. 4, Lines 9-15]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Forthsyth into the teaching of Brewster in order to efficiently share music file in the network.

Regarding claim 2, Brewster does not explicitly teach the method of claim 1, wherein the excerpt further comprises a music playlist. However, Forsyth, in the same field of file sharing endeavor, discloses sharing file including a music playlist among a group of users [see Forsyth, Col. 4, Lines 9-15]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Forthsyth into the teaching of Brewster for the same reason set forth above to claim 1.

Regarding claim 3, Brewster further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the system XML format is a generic XML format that is platform independent and not specific to the configuration of the information handling system [see Fig. 2 and Paragraphs 0005-0006 & 0016-0017].

Art Unit: 2155 Paper Dated 20080908

Regarding claim 4, Brewster further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the excerpt has a generic XML format, and wherein automatically translating the excerpt into the alternate XML format comprises automatically translating the excerpt from the generic XML format into the alternate XML format [see Paragraphs 0016-0017].

Claims 5-8 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claims 1-4.

Claims 9-12 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claims 1-4.

Regarding claim 13, Brewster further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the non-XML format is specific to the configuration of the information handling system [see Fig. 2 and Paragraphs 0005-0006 & 0016-0017].

Regarding claim 14, Brewster further teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the alternate XML format is specific to the configuration of the information handling system [see Fig. 2 and Paragraphs 0005-0006 & 0016-0017].

Claims 16-17 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claims 13-14.

Claims 19-20 are rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claims 13-14.

Art Unit: 2155 Paper Dated 20080908

4. Claims 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brewster et al (Hereafter, Brewster), U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US 2002/0147847 in view of Forsyth, U.S. Pat. No. 7,047,030 and further in view of Markel, U.S. Pat. No. 7,162,697.

Regarding claim 15, Brewster further teaches file sharing and translating file from XML format to different viewable formats [see Brewster, Fig. 2 and Paragraphs 0005-0006 & 0016-0017] and Forsyth, on the other hand, teaches the excerpt (file) is a music playlist [see Forsyth, Col. 4, Lines 9-15] as shown above. Brewster and Forsyth do not explicitly teach automatically translating from the generic XML format to a Windows Media Player format. However, Markel, in the same field of file sharing and translation endeavor, discloses automatically translating from the generic XML format to a Windows Media Player format [see Markel, Col. 7, Lines 5-23]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Markel into the teaching of Brewster and Forsyth in order to efficiently provide a specific viewable format for a particular platform.

Claim 18 is rejected under the same rationale set forth above to claim 15.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2155 Paper Dated 20080908

Other References Cited

6. The following references cited by the examiner but not relied upon are considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- A) Rosenblatt et al, U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US 2004/0199514 A1.
- B) Petersen, U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US 2001/0034667 A1.
- C) Goodman et al, U.S. Pat. No. 7,120,691.
- D) Burton et al, U.S. Pat. No. 7,130,880.
- E) Fujisawa et al, U.S. Pat. Application Pub. No. US 2003/0145056 A1.
- F) Plastina et al, U.S. Pat. No. 7,220,910.
- G) DeMartin et al, U.S. Pat. No. 6,226,672.

Conclusion

7. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CAR 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST REPLY IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 CAR 1.136(A) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT, HOWEVER, WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Art Unit: 2155 Paper Dated 20080908

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-3991. The Group fax phone number is (571) 273-8300. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar, can be reached on

(571) 272-4006.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business

Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Philip B Tran/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2155 Sept 09, 2008